

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of	:	LENOIR, et al.
Serial No.	:	10/599,272
Confirmation No.	:	6405
Filing Date	:	September 25, 2006
Group Art Unit	:	2435
Examiner	:	John B. King
Attorney Docket No.	:	NL 040315

**APPEAL BRIEF
On Appeal from Group Art Unit 2435**

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed on April 8, 2010 and in response to the final Office Action of December 8, 2009 and the Advisory Action dated February 23, 2010.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTERST	3
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	3
III.	STATUS OF CLAIMS.....	3
IV.	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.....	3
V.	SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	4
VI.	GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	7
VII.	ARGUMENT.....	8
VIII.	CLAIMS APPENDIX.....	20
IX.	EVIDENCE APPENDIX.....	27
X.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX.....	28

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The above-identified application is Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V., the assignee of record, whose assignment is recorded in the USPTO as of September 25, 2006 on four (4) pages beginning at Reel 018295, Frame 0426.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

The Appellant is not aware of any pending appeals, judicial proceedings, or interferences which may be related to, directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

- a) Claims 33-60 are pending at the time of filing this Appeal Brief, stand rejected in a final Office Action dated December 8, 2009, and are the subject of this appeal.
- b) Claims 33, 47, and 60 are independent.
- c) Claims 1-32 were previously canceled.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The claims listed in section "VIII. Claims Appendix" of this Appeal Brief correspond to the claims as submitted in the Appellant's responses filed on September 22, 2009 (in response to the Office Action dated June 22, 2009) and on February 8, 2010 (in response to the final Office Action dated December 8, 2009). No claim amendments have been submitted following the response of September 22, 2009, nor are any amendments pending.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER¹

The claimed invention, as recited in claim 33, is directed to a method of generating an Authorized Domain (AD) (see the Appellant's specification at page 4, lines 10-11), comprising: selecting a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain (page 5, line 20); binding at least one user to the domain identifier (page 5, lines 18-19); and binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for each device belonging to the user (page 5, lines 22-26, page 9 lines 26-31), thereby defining that the at least one device is bound to the user (page 5, lines 29-30), or in that the binding of at least one device to at least one user comprises obtaining or generating a Device Owner List for each device to be bound, the Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for a device belonging to the user, thereby defining that the device is bound to the user (page 5, lines 28-30), thereby obtaining a number of devices and a number of users that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain (page 4, lines 12-13).

The claimed invention, as recited in claim 47, is directed to a system for generating an Authorized Domain (see the Appellant's specification at page 4, lines 6-7), comprising: means for obtaining a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain (page 5, line 20); means for binding at least one user to the domain identifier (page 5, lines 18-19); and

¹ It should be explicitly noted that it is not the Appellant's intention that the currently claimed or described embodiments be limited to operation within the illustrative embodiments described below beyond what is required by the claim language. Further description of the illustrative embodiments are provided indicating portions of the claims which cover the illustrative embodiments merely for compliance with requirements of this appeal without intending to read any further interpreted limitations into the claims as presented.

means for binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for each device belonging to the user (page 5, lines 22-26, page 9 lines 26-31) thereby defining that the at least one device is bound to the user (page 5, lines 29-30), or by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List for each device to be bound, the Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for a device belonging to the user thereby defining that the device is bound to the user (page 5, lines 28-30), thereby obtaining a number of devices and a number of persons that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain (page 4, lines 12-13).

The claimed invention, as recited in claim 60, is directed to a computer readable storage medium having stored thereon instructions for causing one or more processing units to execute actions (see the Appellant's specification at page 7, lines 13-15) comprising: selecting a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain (page 5, line 20) binding at least one user to the domain identifier (page 5, lines 18-19); and binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for each device belonging to the user (page 5, lines 22-26, page 9 lines 26-31), thereby defining that the at least one device is bound to the user (page 5, lines 29-30), or in that the binding of at least one device to at least one user comprises obtaining or generating a Device Owner List for each device to be bound, the Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for a device belonging to the user, thereby defining that the device is bound to the user (page 5, lines 28-30), thereby obtaining a number of devices and a

number of users that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain (page 4, lines 12-13).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

- A. Whether claims 47-60 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite.
- B. Whether claim 60 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.
- C. Whether claims 33-35, 37-49, and 51-60 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by US Publication Number 2003/0018491 to Nakahara et al. (“Nakahara”).
- D. Whether claims 36 and 50 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nakahara.

VII. ARGUMENT

The Appellant respectfully traverses the rejections in accordance with the detailed arguments set forth below.

A. Claims 47-60 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

1. Claims 47-59

Appellant respectfully submits that the below argument overcomes this 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection. However, the below argument is directed to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, and why the claim elements meet those requirements. Because the requirements of the sixth paragraph are met, the claim is also definite under the second paragraph and the rejection should be reversed.

The Advisory Action alleges, for example, that in claim 47 “means for binding” is followed by enough structure, e.g. the Device Owner List and the identifiers, to allow the limitation to be performed, thus the Advisory Action alleges the claim is indefinite.

The Appellant respectfully traverses this rejection. A claim limitation will be presumed to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, if it meets the following 3-prong analysis, as set forth in MPEP § 2181(I):

A claim limitation will be presumed to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, if it meets the following 3-prong analysis:

- (A) the claim limitations must use the phrase “means for” or “step for;”
- (B) the “means for” or “step for” must be modified by functional language; and
- (C) the phrase “means for” or “step for” must not be modified by sufficient structure, material, or acts for achieving the specified function.

The Appellant respectfully submits that claims 47-59 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph and MPEP section 2181(I). For example, claim 47 recites:

A system for generating an Authorized Domain, comprising:
means for obtaining a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain;
means for binding at least one user to the domain identifier; and
means for binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for each device belonging to the user thereby defining that the at least one device is bound to the user, or by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List for each device to be bound, the Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for a device belonging to the user thereby defining that the device is bound to the user, thereby obtaining a number of devices and a number of persons that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain.

In the discussion of the third prong of this analysis MPEP § 2181(I) includes example of when 112 ¶ 6 does not apply because the claim limitation itself recites sufficient acts for performing the specified function. The Appellant respectfully points out that in claim 47 “means for binding,” requires, “obtaining or generating a Device Owner List,” (emphasis added). The Examiner appears to point to the claimed Device Owner List and the identifiers, as reciting sufficient structure to allow the limitation to be performed. However, the functional language is “obtaining or generating a Device Owner List.” Appellant respectfully submits that a Device Owner List does not recite sufficient structure or acts for performing the specified function, that is obtaining or generating a Device Owner list.

The MPEP § 2181(I) provides several examples from CAFC cases where 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, was not invoked due to a failure of meeting the 3rd prong of the test. However, in each of these cases the claim further provides a list of the structure underlying the means and the detailed recitation of the structure for performing the function thus removing this element

from the purview of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. In Appellant's claim 47 the "Device Owner List and the identifiers" does not identify structure on how they could "generate" or "obtain" themselves, nor does the claim detail any other structure for performing the generating or obtaining.

Thus, appellant respectfully submits that Claim 47 is not modified by sufficient structure for **obtaining or generating** a Device Owner List. As such, the Appellant respectfully contends that the final Office Action has not met the burden of a showing required to reject the claims and the rejection should be reversed.

2. Claim 60

The Advisory Action suggests that the claimed "computer readable storage medium" of claim 60 should recite a "non-transitory computer readable storage medium" to overcome the rejections to claim 60.

The Appellant respectfully points out that a transitory propagating signal is not included within the scope of claim 60. For example, page 7, lines 13-15 of Appellant's specification recites, "[f]urther, the invention also relates to a computer readable medium having stored thereon instructions for causing one or more processing units to execute the method according to the present invention." Also, page 12, lines 13-15 recite, "[c]ontent rights might also be stored together with the content on for example an optical disk."

The specification does not suggest that a computer readable storage medium can include a signal and the Appellant neither actively nor passively sought to encompass 'a transitory propagating signal' or 'carrier wave' within the meaning of computer readable medium. (See *Ex parte Daughtrey*, Appeal 2008-000202 (BPAI, July 31, 2009), where the BPAI declined to adopt

a definition of the phrase “computer readable medium” that broadly includes signals when the Appellant has clearly stated on the record that the claim does not include signals.).

The Appellant hereby affirms that a transitory propagating signal, is not included within the scope of claim 60. Accordingly, in accordance with the BPAI’s decision in *Ex parte* Daughtrey, the rejection should be reversed.

B. Claim 60 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

3. Claim 60

The final Office Action at pages 3 and 6 alleges that the specification has not specifically defined the term “computer readable storage medium” and therefore can be considered to include mediums such as signals.

A computer-readable medium is an article of manufacture and one of the statutory categories of subject matter under § 101. Both the Federal Circuit as well as MPEP § 2106.01 have deemed a computer-readable medium tangible and statutory.

The Board is directed to BPAI cases *Ex parte* Stanley Bruce Holmstead and Jody L. Terrill, Decided: May 20, 2009. In *Ex parte* Stanley Bruce Holmstead and Jody L. Terrill, the Panel reversed the Examiner’s 101 rejection and held that the Appellant’s claimed computer-readable medium, when interpreted in light of the Specification, fully comports with statutory subject matter.

The specification does not disclose or suggest that the computer readable storage medium can include a signal. Furthermore, the Appellant hereby affirms that a transitory propagating

signal, is not included within the scope of claim 60. (See *Ex parte Daughtrey*, supra.).

Therefore, in accordance with the BPAI and in light of the Appellant's specification as originally filed, the Appellant respectfully submits that the claimed "computer readable storage medium" is directed to statutory subject matter and that the rejection under 101 should be reversed.

C. Claims 33-35, 37-49, and 51-60 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§102(b) as anticipated by Nakahara.

4. Claim 33

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, MPEP 2131 requires the reference to teach every element of the claim. According to MPEP 2131, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

It is respectfully submitted that the final Office Action failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation.

The Appellant's independent claim 33 recites,

A method of generating an Authorized Domain (AD), comprising:
selecting a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain;
binding at least one user to the domain identifier; and
binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or
generating a Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user
and a unique identifier for each device belonging to the user, thereby
defining that the at least one device is bound to the user, or in that the
binding of at least one device to at least one user comprises obtaining or
generating a Device Owner List for each device to be bound, the Device
Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique
identifier for a device belonging to the user, thereby defining that the

device is bound to the user, thereby obtaining a number of devices and a number of users that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain. Emphasis added.

The final Office Action at pages 3-4 and 7-8 alleges that Nakahara at paragraphs [0200] and [0201] discloses every element of the Appellant's claim 33. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintains the 102 rejection, alleging that Nakahara covers the Appellant's claim limitations.

The Appellant has fully considered Nakahara in its entirety and respectfully presents five independent and mutually exclusive arguments which explain why Nakahara does not anticipate claim 33.

First, the Appellant's claim 33 includes the limitation of selecting a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain.

The final Office Action at page 7 and the Advisory Action allege that Nakahara at paragraph [0200] discloses selecting a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain ("Nakahara, paragraph 200, teaches having a domain list that identifies the authorized devices.") The Appellant respectfully traverses this allegation.

Nakahara at paragraph [0200] discloses a domain list method wherein each of the license management units holds a domain list in which are held the function IDs of the function units of the content usage devices that belong to the user domain. However, a domain list is not a unique identifier. A domain list is merely a list of function IDs of the function units. Furthermore, a domain list that identifies devices would not be considered by one of ordinary skill in the art to be identical to a domain identifier uniquely identifying an Authorized Domain because the

device of Nakahara is not the same or equivalent as the Authorized Domain of the Appellant's claimed invention.

Nowhere does Nakahara teach selecting a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain. Accordingly, Nakahara does not teach every element of claim 33 and therefore does not anticipate claim 33. As such, the 102 rejection to claim 33 should be reversed.

Second, claim 33 requires binding at least one user to the domain identifier.

The final Office Action at pages 7 and 8 alleges that Nakahara at paragraph [0200] disclose these limitations ("Nakahara, paragraph [200], teaches searcher X being a user," and "the authorized devices (of Nakahara) being on the domain list.") Also, at pages 3 and 4 the Examiner maintains that Nakahara allegedly teaches a domain list is generated by a user and only a specific user can have access to the domain list because the domain list is password protected, and a user is therefore allegedly bound to the domain list. The Appellant respectfully rebuts these arguments.

As explained above, Nakahara does not disclose selecting a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain. Since Nakahara does not disclose a domain identifier, then Nakahara logically does not disclose binding at least one user to the domain identifier, as required in claim 33. Therefore, Nakahara does not anticipate claim 33.

Furthermore, the Appellant respectfully submits that Nakahara's "searcher X" is not a "user," and thus Nakahara does not disclose binding at least one user to the domain identifier.

Nakahara at paragraph [0120] makes very clear that "... searcher X is any of license management units 1a, 2a, and 3a and the content output units 1b, 2b, 3b, and 4b. . . ." This context of "searcher X" is consistently repeated throughout Nakahara in its entirety. For

example, see paragraphs [0163], “. . . when the searcher X is a license management unit. . . ,” [0166], “. . . the content output units 1b, 2b, 3b and 4b that is to be the searcher X,” [0172], “. . . when the searcher X is any of the content output units 1b, 2b, 3b and 4b,”

Nakahara at paragraphs [0199] and [0200] discloses how each license management unit determines whether the searcher X that requests the license information belongs to the user domain identical to the user domain to which the license management unit belongs. This does not mean that the searcher X is a user. At [0200] and throughout Nakahara in its entirety, “searcher X” is either a license management unit or a content output unit.

Nowhere throughout Nakahara is “searcher X” considered to be a user. Nakahara’s disclosure is completely different from the Appellant’s claimed invention because Nakahara does not disclose the limitation of binding at least one user to the domain identifier, as set forth in the Appellant’s claim 33. Although Nakahara at [0197] may disclose that different usage restrictions may be put on a content usage device 1 for a father’s usage and a content usage device 2 for his son’s usage, and at [0226] apparently discloses user IDs for identifying users that may be registered in advance in association with the function unit IDs, Nakahara does not bind a user to a domain identifier of an Domain. Nakahara’s disclosure in its entirety appears to be directed towards the transfer of server, device, and content information to and from the license management unit, but does not include or suggest the transfer of user information. Therefore, Nakahara is completely different from the Appellant’s claimed invention because Nakahara does not disclose, teach, or even suggest binding at least one user to the domain identifier, as required in the Appellant’s claim 33.

Third, claim 33 requires binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for each device belonging to the user, thereby defining that the at least one device is bound to the user.

The final Office Action on page 8 repeats the citation of Nakahara at paragraph [0200] as allegedly disclosing these limitations.

Nakahara at [0200] discloses a domain list method in which license management units reportedly hold a domain list in which are held the function IDs of the function units of the content usage devices that belong to the user domain identical to that of its own. Although the domain list of Nakahara comprises IDs of the function units of content usage devices, nowhere does Nakahara disclose defining that the device is bound to the user. Thus, Nakahara does not anticipate claim 33.

Fourth, claim 33 includes the limitation of the Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user.

The final Office Action on page 8 repeats the citation of Nakahara at paragraph [0200] as allegedly disclosing this limitation.

Nakahara at [0200] discloses a domain list method in which license management units reportedly hold a domain list in which the function IDs of the function units of the content usage devices that belong to the user domain identical to that of its own. Although the domain list of Nakahara comprises IDs of the function units of content usage devices, nowhere does Nakahara disclose that the domain list also includes a unique identifier for a user. As such, claim 33 is not anticipated by Nakahara.

Fifth, claim 33 requires obtaining a number of devices and a number of users that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain.

The final Office Action on page 8 repeats the citation of Nakahara at paragraph [0200] as allegedly disclosing this limitation. However, nowhere does Nakahara disclose obtaining a number of devices and a number of users that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain. Accordingly, claim 33 is not anticipated by Nakahara.

The Appellant respectfully submits that any one of the five arguments as presented above successfully traverses the rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and as such, the rejection should be reversed.

5. Claim 47

Independent claim 47 is different from claim 1. For example, claim 47 is directed toward a secondary station while claim 1 is directed toward a system for generating an Authorized Domain and includes in part “means for binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List.”

The final Office Action uses substantially the same arguments as set forth with regard to claim 1, alleging that claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Nakahara.

The Appellant repeats the above arguments for claim 1 and applies them to claim 47 to the specific features as recited in claim 47. Claim 47 must be interpreted according to its own specific recitations. As such, the Appellant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claim 47 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is unfounded and should be reversed. Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully submits that claim 47 is in condition for allowance.

6. Claim 60

Independent claim 60 is different from claim 1. For example, claim 60 is directed toward a computer readable storage medium and includes in part “binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List.”

The final Office Action uses substantially the same arguments as set forth with regard to claim 1, alleging that claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Nakahara.

The Appellant repeats the above arguments for claim 1 and applies them to the specific features recited in claim 60. Claim 60 must be interpreted according to its own specific recitations. As such, the Appellant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claim 60 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is unfounded and should be reversed. Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully submits that claim 60 is in condition for allowance.

7. Claims 34, 35, 37-46, 48, 49 and 51-59

Each of dependent claims 34, 35, 37-46, 48, 49 and 51-59 ultimately depends from an allowable parent claim. Furthermore, each dependent claim includes additional distinguishing features. For each dependent claim the Appellant repeats the above arguments from claim 33 and applies them to each dependent claim. As such, the Appellant respectfully submits that dependent claims 34, 35, 37-46, 48, 49 and 51-59 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable base claim and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is unfounded and should be reversed.

D. Claims 36 and 50 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakahara.

8. Claims 36 and 50

Each of claims 36 and 50 ultimately depend from an allowable parent claim. Furthermore, each dependent claim includes additional distinguishing features. For each dependent claim the Appellant repeats the above arguments from claim 33 and applies them to each dependent claim. Thus, the Appellant respectfully submits that dependent claims 35 and 50 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable parent claim and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is unfounded and should be reversed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, the Appellant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 33-60 are in error, legally and factually, and must be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Brian S. Myers/

Brian S. Myers

Attorney for the Appellant

Reg. No. 46,947

Phone: 973-401-7157

For: Kevin C. Ecker

Reg. No. 43,600

Phone: 914-333-9618

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

Claims 1 - 32 (canceled)

33. (previously presented) A method of generating an Authorized Domain (AD), comprising:

selecting a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain;

binding at least one user to the domain identifier; and

binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for each device belonging to the user, thereby defining that the at least one device is bound to the user, or in that the binding of at least one device to at least one user comprises obtaining or generating a Device Owner List for each device to be bound, the Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for a device belonging to the user, thereby defining that the device is bound to the user, thereby obtaining a number of devices and a number of users that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain.

34. (previously presented) The method according to claim 33, wherein each device may be bound to only a single user, or each device may be bound to several users, where one user is indicated as a primary user for that particular device.

35. (previously presented) The method according to claim 34, further comprising

importing, on a given device, at least one content item into the Authorized Domain given by the domain identifier by automatically binding, by default, the at least one imported content item to the single user that the given device is bound to or to the user indicated as primary user for the given device, or

binding the at least one imported content item to another user using additional information, when non-default binding is to be used.

36. (previously presented) The method according to claim 33, further comprising providing an Authorized Domain size limitation, where the limitation relates to a maximum number of users.

37. (previously presented) The method according to claim 33, further comprising using at least one of

- a user identification device as a personal Authorized Domain manager,
- a personal mobile device as a personal Authorized Domain manager,
- a mobile phone as a personal Authorized Domain manager,
- a PDA (personal digital assistant) as a personal Authorized Domain manager.

38. (previously presented) The method according to claim 33, wherein the binding of at least one user to the domain identifier comprises obtaining or generating a Domain Users List comprising the domain identifier and a unique identifier for a user thereby defining that the user is bound to the Authorized Domain.

39. (previously presented) The method according to claim 33, wherein the binding of at least one content item to the Authorized Domain comprises binding a content item to a User Right, where said User Right is bound to a user bound to the Authorized Domain.

40. (previously presented) The method according to claim 39, wherein the User Right comprises rights data representing which rights exists in relation to the at least one content item bound to the User Right.

41. (previously presented) The method according to claim 33, further comprising
controlling access, by a given device being operated by a given user, to a given content item comprising checking whether a user, the given content item is linked to, and a user, the given device is linked to, belongs to the same Authorized Domain, and
allowing access for the given user and/or other users via the given device to the content item if so, and/or
checking if the given content item is linked to a user belonging to the same Authorized Domain as the given user, and

allowing access for the given user via the given device and/or other devices to the content item if so.

42. (previously presented) The method according to claim 33, further comprising

controlling access, by a given device being operated by a given user, to a given content item being bound to the Authorized Domain and having a unique content identifier, comprising checking if the Domain User List of the Authorized Domain comprises both a first user identifier, comprised in a Device Owner List comprising an identifier of the given device, and a second user identifier, linked to the given content item, thereby checking if the user bound to the given device is bound to the same Authorized Domain as the user bound to the content item, and

allowing access to the given content item by the given device operated by any user and/or checking if the Domain User List of the Authorized Domain, that the content item is bound to, comprises a user identifier of the given user thereby checking if the given user is bound to the same Authorized Domain as the content item, and allowing access to the given content item by any device including the given device operated by the given user.

43. (previously presented) The method according to claim 41, wherein the controlling of access of a given content item comprises checking that the User Right for the given content item specifies that the given user has the right to access the given content item and only allowing access to the given content item in the affirmative.

44. (previously presented) The method according to claim 33, wherein every content item is encrypted and that a content right is bound to each content item and to a User Right, and that the content right of a given content item comprises a decryption key for decrypting the given content item.

45. (previously presented) The method according to claim 38, wherein the Domain Users List is implemented as or included in a Domain Users Certificate, and/or the Device Owner List is implemented as or included in a Device Owner Certificate, and/or the User Right is implemented as or included in a User Right Certificate.

46. (previously presented) The method according to claim 33, further comprising binding at least one content item to at least one user.

47. (previously presented) A system for generating an Authorized Domain, comprising:
means for obtaining a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain;
means for binding at least one user to the domain identifier; and
means for binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for each device belonging to the user thereby defining that the at least one device is bound to the user, or by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List for each device to be bound, the Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for a device belonging to the user thereby defining that the device is bound to the user, thereby obtaining a number of devices and a number of persons that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain.

48. (previously presented) The system according to claim 47, wherein each device may be bound to only a single user, or each device may be bound to several users, where one user is indicated as a primary user for that particular device.

49. (previously presented) The system according to claim 48, further comprising means for importing, on a given device, at least one content item into the Authorized Domain given by the domain identifier by automatically binding, by default, the at least one imported content item to the single user that the given device is bound to or to the user indicated as primary user for the given device, or binding the at least one imported content item to another user using additional information, when non-default binding is to be used.

50. (previously presented) The system according to claims 47, further comprising means for providing an Authorized Domain size limitation, where the limitation relates to a maximum number of users.

51. (previously presented) The system according to claim 47, further comprising at least one of
means for using a user identification device as a personal Authorized Domain manager,
means for using a personal mobile device as a personal Authorized Domain manager,
means for using a mobile phone as a personal Authorized Domain manager,
means for using a PDA (personal digital assistant) as a personal Authorized Domain
manager.

52. (previously presented) The system according to claim 47, wherein the means for binding at
least one user to the domain identifier is adapted to obtain or generate a Domain Users List
comprising the domain identifier and a unique identifier for a user, thereby defining that the user
is bound to the Authorized Domain.

53. (previously presented) The system according to claim 47, wherein the means for binding at
least one content item to the Authorized Domain is adapted to bind a content item to a User
Right, where said User Right is bound to a user bound to the Authorized Domain.

54. (previously presented) The system according to claim 53, wherein the User Right comprises
rights data representing which rights exists in relation to the at least one content item bound to
the User Right.

55. (previously presented) The system according to claim 47, further comprising
means for controlling access, by a given device being operated by a given user, to a given
content item, is adapted to check whether a user, the given content item is linked to, and a user,
the given device is linked to, belongs to the same Authorized Domain, and allowing access for
the given user and/or other users via the given device to the content item if so, and/or check if the
given content item is linked to a user belonging to the same Authorized Domain as the given
user, and allowing access for the given user via the given device and/or other devices to the
content item if so.

56. (previously presented) The system according to claim 52, further comprising

means for controlling access, by a given device being operated by a given user, to a given content item being bound to the Authorized Domain and having a unique content identifier, where the means for controlling access is adapted to check if the Domain User List of the Authorized Domain comprises both a first user identifier, comprised in a Device Owner List comprising an identifier of the given device, and a second user identifier, linked to the given content item, thereby checking if the user bound to the given device is bound to the same Authorized Domain as the user bound to the content item, and allow access to the given content item by the given device operated by any user and/or check if the Domain User List of the Authorized Domain, that the content item is bound to, comprises a user identifier of the given user thereby checking if the given user is bound to the same Authorized Domain as the content item, and allow access to the given content item by any device including the given device operated by the given user.

57. (previously presented) The system according to claim 55, wherein the means for controlling access of a given content item is further adapted to check that the User Right for the given content item specifies that the given user has the right to access the given content item and only allow access to the given content item in the affirmative.

58. (previously presented) The system according to claim 47, wherein every content item is encrypted and that a content right is bound to each content item and to a User Right, and that the content right of a given content item comprises a decryption key for decrypting the given content item.

59. (previously presented) The system according to claim 51, wherein the Domain Users List is implemented as or included in a Domain Users Certificate, and/or the Device Owner List is implemented as or included in a Device Owner Certificate, and/or the User Right is implemented as or included in a User Right Certificate.

60. (previously presented) A computer readable storage medium having stored thereon instructions for causing one or more processing units to execute actions comprising:

selecting a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain
binding at least one user to the domain identifier; and

binding at least one device to at least one user by obtaining or generating a Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for each device belonging to the user, thereby defining that the at least one device is bound to the user, or in that the binding of at least one device to at least one user comprises obtaining or generating a Device Owner List for each device to be bound, the Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for a device belonging to the user, thereby defining that the device is bound to the user, thereby obtaining a number of devices and a number of users that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence has been submitted pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of this title nor any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by the Appellant in the appeal.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

The Appellant is not aware of any appeals or interferences related to the present application.